

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Asbrink* (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,574) ("*Asbrink*"), in view of Published Japanese Patent Application JP 56-27509 ("*JP'509*") and allowed claim 7.

Claims 1-7 remain pending in this application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The prior art cited by the Examiner, *Asbrink* and *JP'509*, even if combinable as suggested by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1-6. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has, therefore, not been established.

Claim 1 recites an antenna device including, for example:

- a looped conductor portion comprised of a looped conductive wire;
- and . . .
- a first line for connecting one end of the conductive wire to ground;
- and
- a second line, separate from the first line, for connecting the shield member to ground.

Asbrink discloses an arrangement for preventing disturbances in electronic alarm systems, including a receiver coil screened with a screen or shield and connected to a receiver through a screened transmission conductor (col. 3, lines 8-11; Fig. 1). As illustrated in Figure 1 of *Asbrink*, a conductor (reference 8), a shield (reference 5), and another conductor (reference 9) connect the shield (reference 3) that screens the receiver coil (reference 1) to ground (col. 3, lines 33-36). Figure 1 also shows that the

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

two ends of the receiver coil are ultimately connected to two terminals of an amplifier (reference 2). *Asbrink* does not disclose connecting one end of the receiver coil to ground. Therefore, *Asbrink* does not teach or suggest “a first line for connecting one end of the conductive wire to ground,” as claimed in claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that *JP’509* discloses a shield member “which as a whole covers the looped conductor portion” and a non-covered portion “where the shield member does not cover the looped conductor portion, the non-covered portion corresponding to a portion of the conductive wire including a reference position concerning the symmetry of two terminals for connection between the antenna device and a reception circuit.” (Office Action at page 2). Even assuming that this is correct, which Applicant does not concede, *JP’509* does not cure the deficiencies of *Asbrink*. Figures 1(a) and 2(a) of *JP’509* show that both ends of the conductive wire that forms the looped antenna are free-standing and are not connected to anything. Therefore, *JP’509* does not teach or suggest “a first line for connecting one end of the conductive wire to ground,” as claimed in claim 1.

For the Examiner’s convenience, Applicant submits an English translation of *JP’509*.

Accordingly, *Asbrink* and *JP’509* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1, at least because the references fail to teach each and every element of the claim. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are thus also allowable over *Asbrink* and *JP’509* for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections. Pending claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance, and Applicant requests a favorable action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 20, 2007

By: /Michael R. Kelly/
Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921